

REMARKS

The title has been amended. Claims 4 and 9 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Claims 5 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10 are pending. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original and other claims in this application and in other applications.

Contrary to the Office Action, a certified copy of the Japanese priority application was filed on March 16, 2004. Copies of the corresponding date-stamped postcards are enclosed herewith.

The disclosure is objected to as being informal. The objection is not understood. Reconsideration is requested. The specification margins are all one inch. The application is believed to be in proper form.

The title is objected to as being not descriptive. Reconsideration is requested. The title has been amended to obviate the objection.

Claim 2 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Reconsideration is requested. The recited "first information" is readable on (but not limited to) the inquiry result shown in Fig. 6B, step S52. The "second information" is readable on (but not limited to) the requested service (step S55). Please refer to the specification, page 26, lines 2-6 and 12-15. The invention of claim 2 should not be limited, however, to the preferred embodiments shown and described in the drawings and the specification.

Claims 5 and 7 are objected to as being informal. Reconsideration is requested. The claims have been amended to obviate the objection.

Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Takano. Reconsideration is requested. Claim 1 recites a method of reproducing information using an information recording medium in a client/server system comprising the step of a "server transmitting information based on the usage information to the client." The Office Action contends that step S703 in Fig. 7 of Takano teaches this limitation. In step S703, however, the kiosk returning terminal 110 merely receives information from a distribution center via a kiosk management server.

Claim 2 recites the steps of a client transmitting characteristic information to a first server, the first server obtaining usage information based on characteristic information and transmitting first information to a second server. Takano fails to disclose or suggest these limitations. While the Office Action states that kiosk returning terminal is a client of kiosk management server, it contradicts by stating that the distribution center is the first server. Fig. 1 of Takano indicates that information is transmitted to the distribution center server 101 from kiosk returning terminal 110A via kiosk management server 170A.

Dependent claim 3 should be allowable along with claim 2 and for other reasons.

Claim 5 recites a server providing information to a client comprising a third part configured to transmit to the client information on authorization. In the claimed invention, the client transmits a disk ID to the server for authorization, as shown, for example, in Figs. 7-9. Takano does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of

claim 5. In step S802 of Takano, the system only detects a card's state of renting a content program. Therefore, claim 5 should be allowable over Takano, and dependent claim 6 should be allowable along with claim 5 and for other reasons.

The rejection of claims 7 and 8 should be withdrawn for reasons like those discussed above in connection with claim 5.

Claim 10 is directed to a computer-readable recording medium storing a program for causing a computer to execute a method. Takano is directed to a content programs rental method and does not teach all of the limitations of claim 10. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 10 should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Allowance of the application with claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10 is solicited.

Dated: November 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorney for Applicant